

**MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL #09-001-ACCD
ADDENDUM #1**

July 22, 2008

**RFP NO.: 09-001-ACCD
TO BE OPENED: August 26, 2008**

TITLE: Sanction, Treatment, Assessment, Revocation, and Transition (START) Program

To All Offerors:

Attached are written questions received in response to this RFP. These questions, along with the Department's response, become an official amendment to this RFP.

All other terms of the subject "Request for Proposal" are to remain as previously stated.

Acknowledgment of Addendum:

The offeror for this solicitation must acknowledge receipt of this addendum. This page must be submitted at the time set for the proposal opening or the proposal may be disqualified from further consideration.

I acknowledge receipt of Addendum #1.

Signed: _____

Company Name: _____

Date: _____

Sincerely,

Gary Willems, Contracts Manager

Questions received in response to the Sanction, Treatment, Assessment, Revocation, and Transition (START) Program RFP (09-001-ACCD)

1. Reference 1.4 – Definitions

In this section (**ACA Standards**) it states that the edition referenced is the Adult Community Residential Services. Since this is a secure facility, should the reference be made to Adult Correctional Institutions?

Response: Yes. The appropriate standards reference is the Adult Correctional Institutions.

2. Reference page 14

There is no section 1.10. Please clarify how to respond.

Response: This was a numbering error and section 1.10 was inadvertently omitted. No response to this section is required.

3. Reference 3.6.3 – Program Description, 3.18 - Offender Supervision, and 3.33.3 - Submission of Staffing Pattern

It is our understanding that the MDOC is requiring a direct supervision model in all living areas (housing unit posts). Please clarify that direct supervision is the model.

Response: The amount of direct supervision required is to be determined by the offeror based upon facility design, staffing patterns, video surveillance, etc. MDOC will evaluate all responses for appropriateness.

4. Reference 3.7.1 – [Health Care Services] General and 3.7.6 - Emergency Mental Health Services

These particular subsections discuss the health care services, including: medical, dental, optometric, pharmaceutical, mental health, and other medical-related services. It would be this bidders recommendation that requiring the bidder to provide the services on-site would be in the best interest of all parties involved i.e. MDOC, taxpayer(s), offenders, and general public (safety). The above referenced medical/mental health costs significantly impact the total costs to the MDOC and therefore it is our position that the MDOC revisit this section and consider recognizing and awarding a score based on a total point scale replacing a pass/fail scoring system. Availability and accessibility to these services are critical.

Response: The Department has considered this recommendation and determined that the evaluation of these particular sections will follow the scoring methodology originally identified in the RFP.

5. Reference 3.7.16 – Cost Containment

As referenced in [3.7.1 and 3.7.6], as well as this section, we concur that cost containment is extremely measurable and important and supports our position that all respondents should be evaluated within your point system not on pass/fail. Requiring bidders to include medical and mental health services in the daily per diem allows the MDOC to measure said costs instead of allowing bidders to submit additional medical bills to the MDOC with the expectation that these expenses be additional costs.

Response: The Department has considered this recommendation and determined that the evaluation of these particular sections will follow the scoring methodology originally identified in the RFP.

6. Reference 3.10 - Transportation

This service requires extensive manpower and is labor intensive, in addition to personnel costs there are substantial costs associated with vehicles, fuel, insurance, etc. This expenditure item has a significant impact as a budgetary item and is critically important to facilitating the timely pickup and delivery for all of the correctional facilities in the state, i.e. prerelease, local and regional jails, prisons, etc. and generates huge additional cost savings to the MDOC by running the service throughout the state 5 days a week thereby eliminating log jams and moving offenders on a scheduled basis. It is our observation that this is one of the most important pieces that any selected operator would need to incorporate immediately as a service and therefore respectfully would ask that this section be considered as a scored section (points awarded) instead of pass/fail based on cost savings and importance.

Response: The Department agrees that Transportation is an important aspect of the evaluation process, but it is governed by succinct MDOC policy and that Offeror's have the responsibility and sufficient information to accurately determine their costs. Therefore, the Department has considered this recommendation and determined that the evaluation of Transportation will remain a Pass/Fail as originally identified in the RFP.

7. Reference 3.12.1 - Environment

Currently there is not a screening committee at the START Program. Does one need to be formed for the purpose of screening inmate workers?

Response: No. The Department believes that inmate workers can [reasonably] be selected by the facility administrator and the DOC IPPO, with approval by the DOC Contract Program Manager.

8. Reference 3.12.5.5 – [Facility Design]

It our understanding that MDOC is requiring that the 10 mental health beds should be physically located in a separate, segregated living unit (single cell/wet cell). Once the offender has received the appropriate medical and mental health care and assessments and is stabilized, he will then be classified for transfer into a general population living unit and or returned to prior community placement. Please clarify if this is MDOC's intent.

Response: It is the intent of MDOC that once an offender has received the appropriate medical and mental health care and has been assessed and stabilized, he will then be placed into the appropriate program/facility (i.e., a community program, the START facility, or prison.).

9. Reference 3.28.1 – Annual Reports

This section states that the annual report must include information relative to the current status/location of each offender released from the facility. In the next paragraph it states that the contractor must track release destinations. The question is for the Annual Report does the Contractor have to know the actual status of the offender or just the release destination? Please define the contractor's role in tracking offenders after release.

Response: MDOC will require the Contractor to track the Release Destination only and will work with the Contractor to discuss additional reporting requirements.

10. Reference 4.1.4 – Offeror Financial Stability

This potential bidder is requesting clarification. Is the offeror or the operator and/or both, if necessary, required to provide the financial information as required in this section?

Response: If the offeror is not the operator of the proposed facility, then the Department requires that both parties submit the financial information for review/evaluation by the evaluation committee. .

11. Reference 5.0 – Cost Proposal

Historically, the MDOC has provided the successful respondent with bed guarantees. Will the MDOC provide the successful respondent with a contract that provides a minimum bed guarantee?

Response: MDOC is not opposed to offers that require a contract with a minimum bed guarantee. We understand that a minimum bed guarantee may be a requirement of the financing authority/institution behind this project.

12. Reference 6.0 – Basis of Evaluation

Can you provide a breakdown within each category of how points will be allocated?

Response: Yes. An updated **Section 6.1 - EVALUATION CRITERIA** is included at the end of this document and shall replace the original Section 6.1 in its entirety.

13. Reference 1.1

The proposed language indicates that the length of the contract will be for seven (7) years, unless terminated earlier in accordance with the terms of the contract. The press release that the DOC had released earlier this spring indicated that the contract would be for 20 years, subject to biennial funding from the legislature. Is this an oversight? Will the Department clarify the contract term and justify the change to seven years?

Response: Unfortunately, the press release issued earlier was incorrect. The Department of Corrections has requested, and received, a legal opinion that supports the 7-year contract limitation addressed in 18-4-313, MCA. The Department does not have the specific statutory authority to enter into 20-year contracts for this service, as we do for other community programs under our jurisdiction.

14. Reference the RFP Cover Page

Clarification: In the Instructions to Offeror's section it incorrectly instructs the offeror to mark the outside of the submitted offer with a "Due Date" of August 28, 2008. **This should read AUGUST 26, 2008.** Responses must be received at the designated time and location **not later than AUGUST 26, 2008.**

SECTION 6: EVALUATION PROCESS

6.0 BASIS OF EVALUATION

The evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a **total number of 2,000 points**. **Specific point values for each section will be included with the Departments' response to questions.**

Offers will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. Any offer receiving a "fail" *may* be eliminated from further consideration.

Any response that fails to achieve a passing score per the requirements of Section 2.3.5 will be eliminated from further consideration. A "fail" for any individual evaluation criteria may result in proposal disqualification at the discretion of the procurement officer.

SCORING GUIDE

In awarding points to the evaluation criteria, the evaluator/evaluation committee will consider the following guidelines:

Superior Response (95-100%): A superior response is a highly comprehensive, excellent reply that meets all of the requirements of the RFP. In addition, the response covers areas not originally addressed within the RFP and includes additional information and recommendations that would prove both valuable and beneficial to the State.

Good Response (85-94%): A good response meets all the requirements of the RFP and demonstrates in a clear and concise manner a thorough knowledge and understanding of the project, with no deficiencies noted.

Fair Response (60-84%): A fair response minimally meets most requirements set forth in the RFP. The offeror demonstrates some ability to comply with guidelines and requirements of the project, but knowledge of the subject matter is limited.

Failed Response (0-59%): A failed response does not meet the requirements set forth in the RFP. The offeror has not demonstrated sufficient knowledge of the subject matter.

6.1 EVALUATION CRITERIA

Offeror Qualifications		10% of points for a possible 200 points	
Category		Section of RFP	Point Value
A.	References	4.1.1	P/F
B.	Résumé's/Company Profile	4.1.2	25
C.	Experience/Similar Projects	4.1.2	25
D.	Staff Qualifications		
	1) Selection	3.33.1	5
	2) Certifications	3.33.2	P/F
	3) Staffing Plan	3.33.3	40
	4) Staff Training	3.33.4	5
	5) Background Investigations	3.33.5	P/F
	6) Recruitment & Hiring	3.33.6	P/F
E.	Method of Providing Service/Work Plan	4.1.3	50
F.	Offeror Financial Stability	4.1.4	50

Scope of Project		10% of points for a possible 200 points	
Category	Section of RFP	Point Value	
G. Scope Requirements			
1) Program Mission	3.1	P/F	
2) Goals and Performance Measures	3.2	8	
3) History	3.3	N/A (no score)	
4) Treatment	3.4	N/A (scored elsewhere)	
5) Alcohol and Drug Testing	3.8	7	
6) Offender Files	3.9	P/F	
7) Return to Custody	3.11	P/F	
8) Safety	3.13	40	
9) Work Stoppages	3.14	7	
10) Disasters	3.15	7	
11) Offender Absence/Escape	3.16	7	
12) Unlawful/Suspicious Behavior	3.17	P/F	
13) Offender Supervision	3.18	N/A (scored elsewhere)	
14) Laundry	3.19	7	
15) Food Services	3.20	50	
16) Accountability	3.21	P/F	
17) Agency Security Regulations	3.22	60 (10 points/subsection)	
18) Assumed Control	3.23	P/F	
19) Religious Activities	3.24	7	
20) Offender Rights	3.25	P/F	
21) Offender Telephones/Commissions	3.26	P/F	
22) Offender Commissary/Canteen	3.27	P/F	
23) Fiscal Management/Reporting	3.28	P/F	
24) Visitation	3.29	P/F	
25) Compliance	3.30	P/F	
26) Information Technology	3.31	P/F	
27) Offender Property	3.32	P/F	
28) Subcontractors	3.34	P/F	
H. Siting	3.5	P/F	
Health Services		Pass/Fail	
Category	Section of RFP	Point Value	
I. Health Care Services	3.7 (All)	P/F	
Program Requirements		40% of points for a possible 800 points	
Category	Section of RFP	Point Value	
J. Program Requirements - General	3.6.1	100	
1) Operational Date of Facility	3.6.1.2	100	
K. Program Requirements - Specific			
1) Confidentiality	3.6.2	P/F	
2) Program Description	3.6.3	100	
3) Program Structure and Content	3.6.4	P/F	
4) Program Intake	3.6.5	P/F	
5) Program Sanction	3.6.6	50	
6) Program Treatment	3.6.7	100	
7) Program Assessment Update	3.6.8	200	
8) Program Revocation	3.6.9	50	

Facility Conditions/Design			20% of points for a possible 400 points
Category	Section of RFP	Point Value	
L. Facility Conditions			
1) Environment	3.12.1	80	
2) Furniture/Furnishings/Equipment	3.12.2	P/F	
3) Department Office Space	3.12.3	20	
4) Facility Condition Inventory	3.12.4	P/F	
M. Facility Design			
1) Lockdown	3.12.5.1	50	
2) Fence	3.12.5.2	25	
3) Room Size	3.12.5.3	50	
4) Treatment Rooms	3.12.5.4	50	
5) Mental Health Unit	3.12.5.5	50	
6) Recreation Areas	3.12.5.6	25	
7) Food Service	3.12.5.7	50	

Transportation			Pass/Fail
Category	Section of RFP	Point Value	
N. Transportation	3.10	P/F	

Cost Proposal			20% of points for a possible 400 points
Category	Section of RFP	Point Value	
O. Cost Proposal	5.0	400	

Lowest overall cost receives the maximum allotted points. All other proposals receive a percentage of the points available based on their cost relationship to the lowest. Example: Total possible points for cost is 30. Offeror A's cost is \$20,000. Offeror B's cost is \$30,000. Offeror A would receive 30 points, Offeror B would receive 20 points ($\$20,000/\$30,000 = 67\% \times 30 \text{ points} = 20$).

Lowest Responsive Offer Total Cost

_____ x Number of available points = Award Points

This Offeror's Total Cost

The Department will evaluate the proposed pricing methodologies to determine the method most advantageous to the State (i.e., the most advantageous offer for (A) and the most advantageous offer for (B) will be evaluated against the most advantageous offer for (C) to make this determination).